

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

CHARLES H. HILL,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ISIDRO BACA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:13-cv-00291-RCJ-WGC

ORDER

The court dismissed this action for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Order (#38). Plaintiff has submitted a motion for relief from judgment (#48). First, he complains about his medications. Plaintiff does not address the court's reason why it found that counts 1 through 6, which are the medication-related counts, fail to state claims upon which relief may be granted: The court already had denied those claims on their merits in another action. Second, plaintiff complains that he is not able to pay for photocopies of 654 pages of documents that defendant Baca will not return to him. Those pages are the complaint, which plaintiff already possesses. There is no need for photocopies. The court denies the motion for relief from judgment (#48) and the associated request to compel an order upon the motion (#51).

Plaintiff has submitted three requests for excerpts of the record on appeal pursuant to Circuit Rule 30-3 (#53, #59, #69). The court denies these requests because the court already has sent to plaintiff a copy of the docket sheet, which is what the court has transmitted to the court of appeals.


1 Plaintiff has submitted two requests for production of documents (#54, #62). The court sees
2 no reason to depart from its denial of the same request that plaintiff made previously. See Order (#44).

3 Plaintiff has submitted two requests for correction of clerical omission (#57, #60). The court
4 denies these requests because it has transmitted the docket sheet to the court of appeals.

5 Finally, plaintiff has submitted another motion for relief from judgment (#63), a request for
6 leave to challenge the court's certification that the appeal is not taken in good faith (#66), and an
7 application to proceed in forma pauperis (#68). In the motion for relief from judgment, plaintiff
8 argues incorrectly that the court required him to pay the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g),
9 and that the court failed to take into account that plaintiff is in danger of imminent physical injury or
10 death. The court did not deny plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis (#1); the court
11 granted the application when it dismissed the action. The court also certified pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
12 § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal from the dismissal of the action would not be taken in good faith
13 because the complaint was plainly without merit. Nothing in the motion for relief from judgment
14 (#63) or in the challenge to the court's certification (#66) would cause the court to depart from the
15 ruling that the appeal is not taken in good faith. The court denies the motions and application to
16 proceed in forma pauperis (#68).

17 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that all of plaintiff's pending motions on the docket (#48,
18 #51, #53, #54, #57, #59, #60, #62, #63, #66, #68, #69) are **DENIED**.

19 Dated: June 6, 2014

20
21 
22 ROBERT C. JONES
23 United States District Judge
24
25
26
27
28